

REMARKS

Referring to the numbered paragraphs of the Office Action:

1. A new set of drawings comprising an amended Figure 1 is filed herewith to insert the reference numeral 100 in Figure 1 to indicate the junction between the float and armature. The requested amendment to Page 8 is intended to make it clear that this junction 100 constitutes the "link" of claim 1.

The amendment to Page 10 is intended to make it clear that the portion 20a in the Figure 3 embodiment also constitutes the link, as in the recitation of original claim 9 that the link "is a direct extension of the armature".

Consequently, Applicant submits that the drawings do show every feature specified in the claims.

2. The previously submitted amendment was not intended to introduce any new matter but the exact wording chosen, which seems to be the source of the objection, was perhaps unfortunate. The Examiner seems to have taken the "at least one link" wording to suggest that more than one link per float was being claimed. All the applicant intended was that to the extent that the invention encompasses more than one float, each such float requires a link to the armature. The wording used in the newly requested amendment "link means" is intended to avoid this problem as it is neutral with regard to pluralisation.
3. The parenthetic pluralisation of "float" in claim 1 has been cancelled.
- 4,5. Applicant believes that the objections to claims 1 and 4-10 are met by the amendment to claim 1. Original claim 1 referred to "at least one float linked to the armature" and then went on to refer to the "float(s)", armature and link". All that was meant by "link" in this context is "that which links each float to the armature". It is clearly evident that more than one link in toto was contemplated by the original claims (see e.g. the "link(s)" in original claims 2 and 3) and Applicant submits that the skilled man would, in light of that, understand that "link" in original claim 1 should have read "link (or

links in the case where there is more than one float". However, as noted in 2 above, Applicant believes the expression "link means" in amended claim 1 avoids this difficulty. It should be noted that language which is in substance identical, "linkage means", was used in original claim 8.

- 6-10 In response to these objections, previous claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice. Although Applicant believes that there is patentable subject matter in the previous claim 1 considerations of cost prevent the Applicant from pursuing this point.
11. Claim 1 as now presented is essentially the combination of previous claims 1 and 10, with a minor alteration to make it clear that it is motion of the generator armature which is being referred to; the previous wording incorrectly referred to "motion of the generator". The Examiner indicated that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base claims, namely previous claim 1, which it does and any intervening claims, of which there were none in the case of claim 10. Consequently, amended claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Favourable reconsideration of the application and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, the Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions related to the application, he is urged to contact applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn, at (650)474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22,862